

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK**

-----X
CAPITAL 7 FUNDING,

Plaintiff,

-against-

Case #: 17-cv-02374 (HG) (ST)

WINGFIELD CAPITAL CORPORATION, *et. al.*,

Corporate Defendants,

AND BURGIS SETHNA, a/k/a SETH BURGESS,
HEATH WAGENHEIM, JOSEPH RABITO,
DAMIAN LALJIE a/k/a DAMIAN LALTIE, and
JOHN DOES 1 through 15,

Individual Defendants.

-----X

**SETHNA DEFENDANT'S MEMORANDUM OF LAW
IN SUPPORT OF MOTION TO DISQUALIFY
PLAINTIFF'S COUNSEL**

STEVEN A. METCALF II, ESQ.
Metcalf & Metcalf, P.C.
99 Park Avenue, Suite 810
New York, NY 10016
Phone 646.253.0514
Fax 646.219.2012
metcalflawnyc@gmail.com

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. PRELIMINARY STATEMENT	1
II. THE INSTANT APPLICATION IS NOT TO STALL OR DELAY, AND DOES NOT ALLEGE A PERSONAL ATTACK	3
III. DEPOSITIONS ESTABLISH PLAINTIFF’S COUNSEL IS ONE-OF-FIVE INVESTORS IN CAPITAL 7, EQUATING TO A SPECIFIC PERCENTAGE IN CAPITAL 7’S FIFTY PERCENT (50%) INTEREST IN THE JOINT VENTURE AT ISSUE HERE	5
A. <i>Defendants Have Limited to No Knowledge of Joint Venture – “Throw in Defendants”</i> ...	6
B. <i>How and Who Generated the Company Capital 7 Funding, “the Five”</i>	9
C. <i>Relationships between the Plaintiffs in Capital 7</i>	12
D. <i>Purpose and Vision of Capital 7 Entering into this Joint Venture</i>	14
E. <i>Finances, Investment, and Start-up Money for Capital 7</i>	16
IV. STATEMENT OF LAW	19
V. ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT OF INVOKING RULE 3.7 BECAUSE THE POTENTIAL PREJUDICIAL EFFECT AND THE “NECESSITY” OF SUCH TESTIMONY REQUIRES SUCH FINDING OF DISQUALIFICATION	21
A. <i>Personal Interest Conflicts may Lead to Attorney Disqualification</i>	23
B. <i>The Likelihood of Prejudice Occurring Under the Advocate-Witness Rule is Substantial</i>	26
C. <i>The Necessity of Plaintiff Counsel’s Testimony Invokes Rule 3.7 and Renders Disqualification Appropriate</i>	33
VI. CONCLUSION	36
CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE	37